THEOLOGY

VOL. LVI APRIL, 1953 No. 394

Editorial

A SCOTTISH correspondent in our last issue wrote: "It may not be widely realized south of the Border that episcopacy as practised in Scotland is much more likely to commend itself to the wisest Presbyterians, with their traditional aversion to any kind of prelacy, than its Southern counterpart." As a shaft against the Church of England that is very fairly directed, though members of the Scottish Episcopal Church would be mistaken if they supposed that, in respect of checks upon episcopal power, their method of church government can bear comparison with that of all other provinces of the Anglican Communion. In fact, except for the provinces of Canterbury and York, all other Anglican provinces have now gone further than the Scottish Church in accepting the principle of the right of the laity to participate in the deliberative and legislative assemblies of the Church. Professor Sykes shows this to be the case in the survey of developments in constitutional government throughout the Anglican Communion during the past fifty years, which he has contributed as an introduction to a reprint of the weighty 1902 Report on "The Position of the Laity in the Church".[1]

There have, of course, been important developments in the constitution of the Church of England itself during this period, not least with regard to the status of the laity. But anyone who reads the 1902 Report, which reviews in a most interesting manner the changing forms of church government from the time of the New Testament till the end of the nineteenth century, will realize that a constitutional self-examination, especially concerning the position of the laity, is still much needed in the provinces of Canterbury and York. It was no doubt recognition of the poor constitutional figure which the Church of England cuts alongside its sister and daughter churches that moved the Church Assembly in February to request the Archbishops to appoint a commission to consider afresh "how the clergy and laity can best be joined together in the synodical government of the Church". The operative word is "synodical"; it means that a reform of the constitution and procedure of the Convocations is at last being contemplated. If representatives of the laity are incorporated in provincial synods or in a national synod, it stands to reason that they will also be in diocesan synods.

The claim of the 1902 Report is that according to the standards of the Apostolic age and primitive tradition, the constitution of the Church is neither democratic nor despotic but corporate. Neither

[1] *The Position of the Laity in the Church.* Being the Report of the Joint Committee of the Convocation of Canterbury (1902). Church Information Board. 3s. 6d.

the inferior clergy nor the laity are mere subjects of the episcopate, but every order in the Church has a proper function in legislation, in appointing officers, and in discipline. The Report traces the various ways in which this norm has been both exemplified and distorted in the course of history, and makes the important point that the idea of corporate self-government needs constantly to be re-examined and re-expressed in relation to many different contingent circumstances.

We hope that the Commission, which the Archbishops have undertaken to appoint, will do its work with the same thoroughness as the 1902 Committee did its work, and that its recommendations will be bold and comprehensive. Meanwhile, as a preparatory measure, we strongly recommend the reading of the 1902 Report.

Readers and Deacons[1]

In the year 1937 a book was published that was at one and the same time the expression of a movement already active in the life of the Church, and a powerful impetus to the further development of that movement. The book to which I refer is *The Parish Communion* edited by Fr Gabriel Hebert. In his Introduction, Fr Hebert made it clear that, while the immediate concern of the book was with the Parish Eucharist, "its real aim is to set forth a conception of the nature of the Church, which appears to compel the adoption of the Parish Communion as its necessary expression in liturgy. It is the idea of the Church that is primary" (p. vii).

Of the essays in the book by far the most influential was that of the late Dom Gregory Dix, who explained that the Liturgical Movement "seeks to return behind the mediaeval 'clerical' distortion of the eucharist to a truer and deeper conception of the Church of the Martyrs, only because it has first recovered a more authentic notion of what is involved in the doctrine that the Church is the mystical Body of Christ, that the sovereign Spirit of the Risen Life of Jesus is the very breath of her life" (p. 142).

Again and again in the history of the Church has been sounded the summons to return from contemporary perversion or distortion to an ideal order of things conceived as expressed in some earlier period of the Church's history, and such summons to return have in fact been creative in the periods in which they have been proclaimed. Thus the Romantics appealed to the architecture, the ceremonial, the colour, and the mysticism, of the late medieval period, and brought forth neo-Gothic architecture, the English Use, the English Hymnal, and in the end a better understanding of how our cathedrals and ancient churches should be used. But in making his appeal behind the medieval period to the Patristic Age, Dr Dix has sounded once more in our own times the classical appeal of the Church of

[1] This article is based on a sermon preached before the University of Oxford on 19 October 1952.

England since the Reformation. Did not the Preface to the *First English Prayer Book* make the claim that "Here you haue an ordre for praier (as touchyng the readyng of holy scripture) muche agreable to the mynde and purpose of the olde fathers"? Did not Bishop John Jewel in his *Apology for the Church of England* write: "We have searched out of the holy bible, which we are sure cannot deceive, one sure form of religion, and have returned again unto the primitive church of the ancient fathers and apostles, that is to say to the first ground and beginning of things as unto the very foundations and head-springs of Christ's church"?[1]

The Church of England has always recognized the validity of the appeal to the Scriptures and the Primitive Church: and it is to this authority that the Liturgical Movement, both in this country and on the Continent, makes its appeal. Therein lie sound grounds of hope for the future. But I want to suggest that this appeal has practical implications which have as yet hardly been envisaged.

The hint of what I mean has already been given in the passage from Dr Dix's article which I quoted. There he wrote that the Liturgical Movement "seeks to return behind the medieval 'clerical' distortion of the eucharist".

But there cannot take place a "clerical" distortion of the eucharist unless there has first taken place a "clerical" distortion of the ministry itself. It is not enough for us to give a general assent to the declaration of the Preface to the Ordinal that

> It is euident unto all men, diligently readinge holye Scripture, and auncient aucthours, that from the Apostles tyme there hathe bene these ordres of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishoppes, Priestes, and Deacons,

and to spend our energies on defending episcopacy. Our need is to inquire whether the ministry to-day stands in the same kind of organic relation to the life of the Church as that in which the ministry stood in New Testament and early Patristic times. Again let me echo Fr Hebert's words: "It is the idea of the Church that is primary."

In the Pauline theology the Church is described under the metaphors of the Temple and the Body.[2] The Church is the Temple of God in which the Holy Spirit dwells[3] and is built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner stone:[4] or the Church is the Body of Christ filled with the one Spirit, and of that one Body the individual Christians are the members who as individuals partake of the one Spirit.[5] To these individual members there have been given differing spiritual gifts. Some are apostles, others prophets, others teachers, others have power over demonic forces, others can heal the sick, others give the service of deacons, others the counsel of presbyters, while last of all there are those who speak with tongues.[6] But these spiritual gifts are not

[1] *The Works of John Jewel*, The Third Portion, edited for the Parker Society by J. Ayre, p. 106; Latin text p. 46.
[2] F. W. Dillistone, *The Structure of the Divine Society*, p. 58 ff.
[3] 1 Cor. 3, 16. [4] Eph. 2. 19–22. [5] 1 Cor. 12. 12–27.
[6] 1 Cor. 12. 27–30.

private possessions in which the individual members may take a personal pride. The gifts are given in the Body and for the sake of the Body of which Christ is the Head.

In chapters 11-14 of 1 Corinthians we have a very vivid description of what happened when the Church in Corinth assembled. What most astonishes us is its Pentecostal or pneumatic character. Here clearly is the Church of the New Covenant in which the prophecies of Jeremiah[1] and of Joel[2] have been fulfilled. But in Corinth at least this Pentecostal character of the Church is running to dangerous extremes: and St Paul was concerned to bring that worship under discipline—a liturgical discipline first of all, "I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you";[3] a discipline of hierarchy in which ἀγάπη was recognized as the highest spiritual gift, and the sensational glossalalia were placed in the lowest rank; and finally a discipline of propriety, "Let all things be done decently and in order".[4] What St Paul did not do was to deny the Pentecostal character of the Church. On the other hand, he declared it to be the Temple in which the Spirit dwells, the Body filled with the one Spirit. Nevertheless, by these injunctions he gave a powerful impetus to the transition to the ordered liturgical worship which we find described by Justin Martyr and by Hippolytus.

It is with that transition that we are first concerned. In his essay on *Abendländische Liturgiegeschichte* Dr Klauser writes:

> At the outset, there were two forms of Divine Service, the Service of the Word, held on Sunday mornings, with its lections, sermon and prayer, and the Eucharist in conjunction with a full meal. . . . At an early date the meal was separated under the name of the Agape. . . . The Celebration of the Eucharist, on the other hand, was removed, probably in the second century, to the morning, and combined with the Service of the Word.[5]

According to this generally held theory, the Service of the Word, the Synaxis, the *Missa Catechumenorum*, was derived directly from the Jewish synagogue service.[6] This theory has recently been challenged by Dr Oscar Cullmann,[7] who notes two points where the eucharist as described by Justin does not correspond with the assemblies of the earliest communities. The first is the disappearance of the charismatic phenomena and the development in its place of a service that looks like an unfolding of the synagogue service. The second is that the eucharist has lost its character of a genuine meal, and has gained instead the character of a cult meal.[8] Cullmann sees the development as starting rather from what we find described in Acts 20. 7–11—a long proclamation of the Word by St Paul ending

[1] Jer. 31. 31–4. [2] Joel 2. 28–9. [3] 1 Cor. 11. 23. [4] 1 Cor. 14. 40.

[5] T. Klauser, *The Western Liturgy*, pp. 13–14, translated by F. L. Cross from *Abendländische Liturgiegeschichte* (1949).

[6] C. W. Dugmore, *The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office*, pp. 88, 95, 111–13.

[7] *Urchristentum und Gottesdienst* (1950), pp. 29–35; *Le Culte dans l'Église primitive*, pp. 26–33, a tr. of Pt. 1 of *U. u G.* from the 1st edition.

[8] *Urchristentum und Gottesdienst*, pp. 32–3; *Le Culte dans l'Église primitive*, pp. 29–30.

in the eucharist.[1] St Paul's long sermon was no doubt exceptional. On another occasion

> When ye come together, each one hath a psalm, hath a teaching, hath a tongue, hath an interpretation.[2]

The Church of the New Testament was apostolic, and the apostles had authority. But next after apostles St Paul names prophets[3] and then passes on to other charismata. And Cullmann[4] notes how completely free was the primitive Church to introduce psalms and hymns and other liturgical formulas side by side with the spontaneous utterances of the Spirit. Fragments of these hymns are found in the New Testament.[5] It is within this context that Dr. T. W. Manson's judgment is valid:

> When the congregation assembles each member is a potential contribution to the service. . . . The Ministry of the Word is the business of the whole community; and any number can take part in it.[6]

A little later we find Pliny relating to Trajan that the Christians were accustomed to meet before daybreak to sing a hymn to Christ as though he were a God, and to take an oath which looks like a liturgical recitation of the decalogue.[7] By the time we come to Justin the *laos* was ceasing to be an active and was on its way to becoming a passive *laos*. The preacher of the sermon was the president—*ὁ προεστὸς*.[8]

Yet it would seem that there survived from the days when each member of the *laos* was a potential contributor to the service one figure at least—that of the reader—*ὁ ἀναγινώσκων*. St Paul required that his epistles should be publicly read to the brethren when the Church assembled.[9] Timothy was exhorted to "give heed to reading, to exhortation, to teaching".[10] The author of the New Testament Apocalypse was able to assume that his Revelation would be publicly read in the Christian assemblies. "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of the prophecy."[11] In the homily known to us as II Clement a distinction is drawn between the author's own carefully read homily—"I am reading you an exhortation to pay attention to that which is written, that you may both save yourselves and him who is the Reader among you"[12]—and the freer exposition of the Presbyters: "And let us not merely seem to believe and pay attention now, while we are being exhorted by the Presbyters."[13] By the time we come to Justin, the reader would seem to have lost any responsibility he may have had for the exposition of the Scriptures which he

---

[1] *Urchristentum und Gottesdienst*, p. 31; *Le Culte*, p. 28.
[2] I Cor. 14. 26; cf. Col. 3. 16; Eph. 5. 19.
[3] I Cor. 12. 28; cf. Eph. 2. 20; 4. 11.
[4] *Urchristentum und Gottesdienst*, pp. 23–7; *Le Culte*, pp. 18–23.
[5] Rev. 5. 9, 12, 13; 12. 10–12; 19. 1–2, 6.
[6] *The Church's Ministry* (1948), p. 57.
[7] Pliny, *Epp.*, X. xcvi. 7.
[8] Justin, *First Apology*, lxvii. 4.
[9] I Thess. 5. 27; Col. 4. 16; cf. Bultmann on *ἀναγινώσκω*, *ἀνάγνωσις*, in Kittel, *T.W.N.T.*, vol. 1, p. 347.
[10] I Tim. 4. 13.
[11] Rev. 1. 3.
[12] II Clement xix. 1.
[13] II Clement xvii. 3.

read. And yet so late a document as the *Apostolic Constitutions* has preserved a prayer which reflects the time when the office of Reader was regarded as charismatic:

> O eternal God . . . do thou also look down upon thy servant, who is to be entrusted to read thy holy Scriptures to the people, and give him the Holy Spirit, the prophetic Spirit. Thou who didst instruct Esdras thy servant to read thy laws to the people, do thou now also at our prayers instruct thy servant, and grant that he may without blame perfect the work committed to him.[1]

Harnack, in his monograph *Über den Ursprung des Lectorats*,[2] justly asks, "Can this prayer . . . have been composed in the fourth century?" and replies, "Certainly not, as little as most of the other consecration prayers in the eighth book of the Constitutions. . . . This prayer belongs to Christian antiquity, or at least points back to it. It shows us that the reader was once reckoned among the persons who had the charisma".[3]

This prayer implies further an ordination to the readership, but from the other Church Orders we learn that the reader was normally appointed by the bishop handing him the Scriptures, and that hands were not laid upon him.[4]

With regard to what the reader read, it is clear that, to quote Dr F. E. Brightman, "The office of the Reader was to recite from the pulpit the Lessons and the Gospel at the Mass of the Catechumens".[5] And although the right to recite the Gospel was later taken from him by the deacon, we know from the Epistles of Cyprian[6] that in Carthage he was still reciting the Gospel from the pulpit as late as the second half of the third century. Further, as Lietzmann[7] has pointed out, "readers were skilled in the difficult art of using a melodious voice and the correct rhythm in reading passages aloud from the Biblical codices which were written without spaces between the words and without punctuation marks". Further, as Harnack has noted, the readers in Carthage stood in close relation to the presbyters.[8] And though Cyprian described readers and sub-deacons as *clerico proximi*,[9] as next to the clergy, and so did not regard them as belonging in strictness to the clerical order, he did not hesitate to say

[1] P. A. de Lagarde, *Constitutiones Apostolorum*, VIII. 22, p. 264; J. Donaldson, *The Apostolic Constitutions* (A-N.C.L.), p. 240.

[2] *Texte und Untersuchungen*, vol. II (1884), English translation; "The Origin of the Readership" in *Sources of the Apostolic Constitutions*, by J. Owen.

[3] A. Harnack, op. cit., pp. 73–4, Eng. tr., p. 69.

[4] Hippolytus, *Apostolic Tradition*, XII; Dix p. 21; Easton p. 40. G. Horner, *Statutes of the Apostles*, Ethiopic text p. 147, Arabic text p. 248, Saidic text p. 309. Here the book given is "the book of the apostle".

[5] In *Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry*, edited by H. B. Swete (1918), p. 389.

[6] St Cyprian, *Ep.* XXIV, XXXIII and XXXIV.

[7] H. Lietzmann, *The Founding of the Church Universal* (e.t. 1938), pp. 330–1.

[8] A. Harnack, op. cit., pp. 62–4; Eng. tr. pp. 58–60; cf. Connolly, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 90: "But if there be also a lector, let him too receive with the presbyters."

[9] J. H. Bernard, *The Cyprianic Doctrine of the Ministry* in H. B. Swete, *Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry* (1918), p. 230, note 1; A. Harnack, op. cit., p. 63, Eng. tr. p. 59.

that he had ordained (*ordinatum*) a confessor to the office of reader. Confessors had been granted the right to a seat with the presbyters without ordination.[1] Cyprian required that they should first serve an apprenticeship as readers, though he held out the hope of later ordination to a higher degree.

The office of reader was then exercised in the Synaxis, in the *Missa Catechumenorum*. The deacon, on the other hand, was ordained "for the service of the bishop that he may do the things commanded by him",[2] and he exercised his liturgy in the Eucharist proper, in the *Missa Fidelium*. He was ordained "to offer in thy holy sanctuary the gifts that are offered to thee by thine appointed high priests".[3] In the *Didascalia Apostolorum* the bishop is instructed:

> But of the deacons let one stand always by the oblations of the Eucharist; and let another stand without by the door and observe them that come in; and afterwards, when you offer, let them minister together in the Church.[4]

And the deacon's duty of guarding the oblation included the duty of protecting the Holy Things from an unholy approach:

> Wherefore, O bishops, that your oblations and your prayers may be acceptable, when you stand in the Church to pray, let the deacon say with a loud voice: "Is there any man that keepeth aught against his fellow?"[5]

Most important of all

> after he who presides has given thanks, and all the people have said "Amen", those who are among us called deacons give to every one of those present to partake of the bread and wine and water over which thanks were given, and bear them away to those who are absent.[6]

So definitely was the administration of the communion in both kinds to the people the duty of the deacons, that the custom arose in some places of deacons communicating presbyters—a practice which the Council of Nicaea found it necessary to forbid with its 18th Canon. Or was this, despite the denial of the Canon, a survival of ancient custom?

One thing, however, would appear to emerge quite clearly from our examination of the evidence. In the early period the reader exercised his ministry from the ambo or pulpitum, while the deacon was concerned with the oblation and served the Table of the Lord. It was, it would seem, only later that the bishop and the presbyters began to administer the communion to the people,[7] and the deacons began to take over from the reader the reading of the Gospel from the ambo.[8]

---

[1] Hippolytus, *Apostolic Tradition*, X. 1; Dix p. 18, Easton p. 39.
[2] Hippolytus, *Apostolic Tradition*, IX. 2; Dix p. 15, Easton p. 38.
[3] Hippolytus, *Apostolic Tradition*, IX. 11; Easton p. 39, Dix p. 17; XXIII. 1, Dix p. 40, Easton p. 48.
[4] Connolly, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 120.
[5] Connolly, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 117.
[6] Justin, *First Apology*, LXV. 5.
[7] Hippolytus, *Apostolic Tradition*, XXIII; Dix p. 41; Easton p. 49; XXIV, Dix p. 43, Easton p. 58.
[8] *Constitutiones Apostolorum*, II. 57. G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, pp. 135–7, gives a convenient short history of the administration of communion in the patristic period.

I now come to the application to our contemporary needs and problems of certain conclusions drawn from the ministry in the primitive church. Dr Herbert Butterfield has written: "We are back for the first time in something like the earliest centuries of Christianity, and those early centuries afford us some relevant clues to the kind of attitude to adopt."[1] The most pressing problem that faces us arises from the fact that, despite manifest signs of life in the parishes, the Church of England seems to be unable, along traditional lines, to provide enough trained clergy to man the parishes, or to provide the stipends to enable them to devote themselves to the work.

At such a time the first temptation is to try to secure the men by lowering standards, and no one has made a finer apology for such a course than did Richard Hooker in his *Ecclesiastical Polity*:

> The question in truth is not whether learning be required, but whether a church wherein there is not sufficient store of learned men to furnish all congregations should do better to let thousands of souls grow savage, to let them live without any public service of God, to let their children die unbaptized, to withhold the benefit of the other sacrament from them, to let them depart this world like Pagans . . . than as it doth in this necessity, to make such presbyters as are so far forth sufficient although they want that ability of preaching which some others have.[2]

The second possible solution takes advantage of Dr. T. W. Manson's reminder concerning the settled ministry:

> It need not be a whole-time job. It need not be paid. It need not have been to a theological college. Its only fundamental requirement is fitness and willingness to give the kind of service that is needed in the common life of a colony of heaven.[3]

Here we have the grounds for the case for Tent-maker priests, so ably put forward in THEOLOGY by Mr W. O. Chadwick.[4] But, strong as is Mr Chadwick's case, he has not really answered the Archdeacon of Nottingham's objection that "there can be no solution apart from the provision of sufficient full-time priests. It is the pastoral ministry of the Church which is so lacking today".[5]

The solution that I would venture to commend is one of maintaining the priesthood as a full-time ministry requiring a thorough training and preparation, and at the same time greatly expanding both the readership and the diaconate as part-time ministries in the Church of God.

A great expansion of at least the employment of readers[6] is unquestionably taking place. Without the service of these devoted and self-effacing men the parochial system in this country would already have broken down. But the tendency is to use them to conduct the services in the mission church, or in the parish church when no priest is available. It is comparatively rarely that they exercise the liturgy from which they take their name—the reading of one or more

[1] *Christianity and History*, p. 135. [2] *Ecclesiastical Polity*, V. lxxxi. 5.
[3] *The Church's Ministry*, p. 55.
[4] "Tent-makers" in THEOLOGY, February 1951.
[5] "Vocation to the Ministry" in THEOLOGY, July 1950.
[6] A convenient short history of Readers in the Church of England since the Reformation is to be found in *Lay Work and the Office of Reader*, by H. Yeatman-Biggs, formerly Bishop of Southwark (Handbook for the Clergy), 1904.

of the lections in the Communion Service—in the presence of the priest. In the majority of parishes clericalist presuppositions lead the ordained ministry to regard these lections as their prerogative. The result is a certain denial of status to readers, and, following from this, a failure to recruit the readers from the better educated members of the congregation.

But at the same time readers are allowed to preach—often with very inadequate training for the task. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that if they were given a firmer status in the congregation a higher standard of training could be required of them, at least if they are to be licensed to preach, as well as appointed to read the lessons in the Church of God.

It is with regard to the office and work of deacons that the precedent of the early Church suggests the possibility of wide changes from contemporary practice. The Church of England has retained the order of deacons, but has retained it only as an apprenticeship to the priesthood. The training that the candidate for the diaconate undergoes is a training for priesthood. Not only does the candidate himself expect, after a year's ministry as a deacon, to be ordained a priest, but it is as a priest that he is wanted in the parishes. And whenever the possibility of restoring a permanent diaconate has been raised, the proposal has been resisted on the grounds that the need of the parishes is for celebrants at the eucharist, and that, from the point of view of the deacon himself, a permanent deacon would be no more than a frustrated priest.

These objections are unanswerable in the case of men whose vocation is to priesthood, and whose training is such as would fit them for that office. Yet I have the impression that amongst those that C.A.C.T.M. Selection Boards rightly reject as unsuitable candidates for priesthood—and every priest is potentially an incumbent of a parish—there are not a few who are genuinely called of God to service in his Church; while from the other side I note that bishops have found it necessary to license some readers to administer the chalice—in other words, to do the work of deacons. And the degree to which bishops are willing to license readers to administer the chalice is much less than the need. The task itself is simple enough, and the training for it such as could be given in the parishes. Why then should parish communions be unnecessarily prolonged? Why should there be lacking a sufficient number of ministers to administer the communion on major festivals, because there are no deacons to assist the priest? Surely this is where we should begin to experiment with Tent-makers. In every congregation there are laymen who have the respect of the faithful—churchwardens, sidesmen, and very often a verger—who could be called to the diaconate, and who would willingly exercise the office of deacon on Sundays at least, if that did not involve giving up the work by which they earn their living.

What I am picturing in every parish church is a Eucharist that would remarkably resemble that described by Justin. It is the incumbent who would be the president: and Dr T. W. Manson has reminded us that "the normal daily duties of the Hippolytean bishop

are precisely those nowadays performed by the parish priest".[1] There would be two, three—perhaps six or seven—deacons who would administer communion and perform the duties of churchwarden, verger, sidesmen and the like. And there would be two or three readers. Outside the church building they could exercise some pastoral care in the neighbourhood of their homes. During a vacancy, and perhaps at other times, they could maintain the daily offices. Indeed, during a vacancy the life of the Church could go on as usual, save that it would be necessary to borrow a priest to preside at the Eucharist.

Something like this is already happening in some parishes. But it cannot go very far unless the bishops are prepared to make deacons on quite a large scale.[2]

But the deacons would not be content to remain deacons. That I believe is the bishops' fear. Some unquestionably would not be prepared to remain deacons. There is the untapped source for future priests. But the Tent-maker deacon would know that, if he wished to offer himself as a candidate for priesthood, he would have to give up his secular employment and face the training necessary for the office and work of a priest as our Ordinal understands it: "Take thou Authority to preach the Word of God, and to minister the Holy Sacraments." In the priest, Word and Sacraments and Pastoral Care go together: and, as Gregory the Great exclaimed, "What rashness is it . . . for the unskilful to assume pastoral authority, since the government of souls is the art of arts."[3]

But zeal for the priesthood must not be allowed to result in clericalism, the taking over by the priesthood of the liturgies of other ministries in the Church of God, so that the people of God are reduced to passivity in the assembly.

I have ventured to advocate in the present emergency a great increase in the number and use of readers and deacons. But I hope that I have not given the impression that I have advocated this merely because of the present emergency. Rather do I see the present emergency as the way in which God is renewing his Church by calling into activity powers latent in the members of his Body. My concern is that these charismata should not be repressed as a consequence of clericalist presuppositions. The charismata have been given to be used.

J. O. Cobham.

Great Pastors—IV. St Philip Neri (1515–1595)

(*Note.*—This article deals only with St Philip Neri's pastoral ministry before he became a priest. It is based on extracts from the English translation of Père Bouyer's book about St Philip, which is to be published shortly under the title *The Roman Socrates.*)

---

[1] *The Church's Ministry*, p. 68.

[2] In the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. the canons have recently been amended to allow men of 32 years of age and older to be ordained to a perpetual diaconate after a modified academic training.

[3] St Gregory the Great, *Liber Regulae Pastoralis*, I. 1. This was written of the episcopate, but is valid of the priesthood.

Philip Neri was born in Florence on 21 July 1515. Even the most pious of his biographers have been unable to hide the fact that he was a normal healthy child, untouched by any of those religious crazes which sometimes divert even the naughtiest children. "Pippo" had no taste for building himself little altars and never expressed any intention of becoming a priest or monk. He was only just eighteen when he left his native city to try his luck with an uncle who had some money to leave. The well-to-do Romolo welcomed him as a son to the little town of San Germano, which nestles in the shadow of Monte Cassino, hoping to hand on to him his business as soon as possible. Philip brought all his usual enthusiasm to this work, but then something happened. It is unlikely that he had any misunderstanding with his uncle, for he used to make a friend of everyone he met, but before very long he had given it all up and taken the road to Rome, to settle there for the rest of his life.

He reached Rome towards the end of 1535. Some have maintained that the Renaissance died in 1527 with the sack of Rome by the Bourbon troops, a view certainly held by men like Michelangelo, who despaired of any return to those enchanted days, a belief justified as we know by future events, but not the view of those who were young at the time. With all the irresponsibility of youth they sought to retain the former pattern. The passion for antiquity and the dazzling springtime of art and poetry were still alive, and men's thoughts and passions knew no bounds. Strange figures now appeared like apocalyptic warnings in the midst of the pagan carnival which went on in spite of everything. There was Brandini, the famous hermit, foretelling more ruin and retribution for this modern Nineveh; Matteo da Boscio, the lay-brother from the Umbrian hills, seeking permission to return to the primitive Franciscan poverty, founding the Capucins as if by accident; and Titelmans, the astonishing Dutch professor, who later joined Matteo Boscio in petrifying the passers-by on the Ponte Sant'Angelo, where he had set up his pulpit, with his cries of "Hell for sinners! hell for adulterers!"

Nevertheless, the countless Florentines attracted to Rome by the two Medici popes, Leo X and Clement VIII, were still there, and they had lost nothing of their frivolity. They had taken possession of a whole district in Rome on the left bank of the river, near the bridge which leads past Hadrian's Mausoleum to the Vatican. Their church, standing on the banks of the river, was imposing but unfinished, a fitting symbol of their overweening pride which died with the two Medicis.

In the studios of the jewellers, painters, and sculptors, and in the banks where usury flourished, there was gathered a whole generation of intelligent, charming, impudent, spoilt young men, pursuing an entirely aesthetic culture. This new epicureanism taught that a correct, if not irreproachable, moral life was no more than the final touch of elegance, surrender to the passions being repugnant to one who sought balance and harmony. Such a frail barrier might have been sufficient in a civilization dying of its own refinement, in a

civilization where passions had been dulled by the impoverishment of its stock and by inner decay. The case was very different now. A younger and more vigorous generation, captivated by beauty, freed from all control, and suspicious of any restraint, surrendered to the past and gave birth to a new paganism, far more disturbing than the old. For these merely hereditary Christians, the magic of pagan pleasures was seen through a nostalgic veil, as of some lost paradise. The grossest sin had but to clothe itself in beauty to be overlooked. One finds in the young Florentines, whom Philip met in the Eternal City, a paradoxical union of idealism and carnal passion, a languishing mysticism which can never be satisfied.

What place had he in such a garden as this, where even the loveliest flowers smell of brimstone? The call from his peaceful retreat at San Germano to the turmoil of Rome was unquestionably a call to the apostolate. He set himself at once to win back the youth to Christ, but what weapons was he to use against the old pagan magic? He was not attracted by any of the more ancient religious orders, though he had many friends in them. It was not that he condemned any method, old or new. Let those use them who made them. For his part, he could never adapt himself to them. He was too simple, too spontaneous, too direct, perhaps even too lively, to place any armour between himself and the world he planned to conquer. Though this involved the loss of many resources both in attack and defence, it did away with anything that could hinder direct contact with the souls he sought. As it was, everyone could find immediate access to his mind and heart.

His tactics were entirely spiritual, and no one could avoid his influence except by avoiding him. There he was like another Socrates, with apparently nothing else to do but wander about the Roman streets joining every kind of group quite freely, as ready to play quoits as to pass his time in any shop where customers without intending to buy anything could talk indefinitely. Far from being put out by banter, he soon earned a reputation for more than holding his own. His presence attracted the gossips and jokers, who could be sure of entertainment in his company; the vague fear of being told the truth about themselves merely added spice to the occasion.

This is not to imply that he hid his religion, but his very exhortations took the form of quips, and his witticisms left a tiny spark in the soul that did not die out easily. His shrewdness is shown by the fact that a teasing joke thrown out in passing often altered the whole course of someone's life. Some called him "the electric eel", an apt nickname, for contact with him electrified the most drowsy consciences. They would be roused from their lethargy as though by a shock and drawn by a magnetic force to join that happy band which could set off on a pilgrimage as if to a party.

It should be particularly noted that Philip neither taught any special doctrine nor any special devotions. He gave no orders, and asked nothing except perhaps by some pleasantry, the sense of which might not at first be apparent; yet no one could live in his company for any length of time without changing of his own free will. If he

did ever intervene, it was to moderate enthusiasm rather than to arouse it, and he would do this in his own inimitable way. When for example the somewhat ostentatious Tarugi asked him if he could wear a hairshirt, he was told: "Certainly, as long as you wear it over your doublet."

This unusual apostolate, depending for its effect on personal influence alone, on simple friendship in which a soul's whole life may be transformed, was not without its dangers. Yet Philip's method, based on freedom and confidence, and apparently outrageously optimistic, made him the victorious apostle of neo-pagan Rome. If his victory is to be understood, another side of his personality must be borne in mind. This man who spent the whole day in the streets led another life concealed even from those who thought they knew everything about him.

What did he live on? Almost nothing. A Florentine customs officer gave him a home, on condition that he educated his two sons. Philip slept in a corner of the customs house; a clothes line was his wardrobe, and his food a daily handful of corn and olives. The charwoman who used to watch him eating his ration every morning by the well in the courtyard could have enlightened those learned critics who later described his spirituality as a mysticism without asceticism.

If anyone had followed him in the evening, after he had spent the whole day among young people without a moment to himself, and after his continual wanderings about the town had so wearied his limbs that they called out for rest, they would have been astonished to find that he used to leave the city and in solitude make his way to the catacombs, whose attraction he was one of the first to discover.

This strange buried world still held intact, within its shrine of silent night and secret freshness, the early vanished life of Christian Rome. Philip was as much at home here as in the sun-drenched streets, where all we see is his gaiety. Here, surrounded by the symbols of immortal life, he more than makes up for the sleep he has denied himself, by prayer in which the invisible world stands clearly revealed to his inward eye. He can no more dispense with this solitude thronged with spirits, a solitude denied him during the day, than could the monks of old whom he admired so much. Like them, he wishes to plunge himself, forgetful of time, deep into that absolute silence in which alone the Heart of God can speak to the heart of man.

His surprising freedom of spirit in the frivolous world, where so many others, even saints, dare not venture without a host of safeguards, springs from his strange familiarity with this hallowed world of the catacombs. When he leaves them, all the clamour of the world is drowned for him in the echoes of eternity. Invigorated by his contact with the martyrs, his thirst quenched at the very source of Christianity, completely dead to the world so as to live to God, he is able to live in this world as though he were already in heaven, so completely centred on the world to come that this transitory world leaves him untouched.

It would be impossible to stress too much the importance of these two elements in Philip's life, which can be explained only by the paradoxical combination of primitive asceticism and humanistic freedom. He was able to associate so intimately with others, and soften the hearts of the most godless of them, only because of the wealth of grace and love that he derived from his deep interior life. He was able to mix freely with men enslaved by the world only because he would escape from it himself. This wonderfully human saint was saturated in the supernatural; this Florentine, while being a man of his times, seems to have stepped out of the Acts of the Apostles, and has justifiably been given the title "The Apostle of Rome".

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Louis Ponnelle and Louis Bordet, *St Philip Neri and the Roman Society of his times* (Sheed and Ward).
P. J. Bacci, *St Philip Neri* (Burns Oates and Washbourne).
Cardinal Capecelatro, *St Philip Neri* (Burns Oates and Washbourne).
F. L. Antrobus, Cong. Orat., *The Excellences of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri.*

Ponnelle and Bordet give a very full list in their work of the literature on St Philip.

L. Bouyer.

Euthanasia

The question of euthanasia, or "mercy-killing" as it is popularly called, is one that rises to the surface only occasionally, when some actual case comes to light. For the most part the discussion of its rights and wrongs is carried on by ordinary conversation, or occasional articles in newspapers, and very little seems to have been written about it by serious moralists.

Suicide was, of course, approved in the ancient world generally for those who found the problems of life intolerable, and presumably euthanasia would have been too, but the uncertainties of medical diagnosis in those days prevented it from being a live issue, if such a description could ever be applied to voluntary death. Equally one could take the general disapproval of suicide in the main tradition of Christian ethics to cover euthanasia also, but it is surprising to find Sir Thomas More depicting the priests and magistrates in Utopia as exhorting incurable sufferers to take the plunge and depart this life after receiving the last rites of the Church.

In general, Christian opinion has opposed all forms of suicide, but a serious attempt was made about fifteen years ago to introduce a Bill to make euthanasia legal, supported by such important figures in the Church as Dr W. Inge, Dr W. R. Matthews, Canon Peter Green and "Dick" Sheppard. The Bill got as far as debate in the House of Lords, but was then defeated largely owing to the opposition of Lord Horder. Canon Green had already declared himself in favour of it in his book *The Problem of Right Conduct*, written in 1931, in which he argues that euthanasia would avoid many suicides—clearly he does not regard it as a form of suicide—and much avoidable suffering. He would have it safeguarded by a sworn declaration by the

sufferer that it was being carried out at his or her request, and he sees nothing against the last rites of the Church being administered before it takes place. Of the arguments against it, he dismisses that which would regard it as wrong because God alone can decree the span of life with the counter-argument that capital punishment could equally be regarded as immoral on such a ground, and the argument that it is wrong to evade suffering he answers by pointing to anaesthetics. He can in fact see nothing against it, but admits that it is not likely to become legal because of the opposition not of the moralists but the doctors, a prophecy which was proved accurate by the stand taken by Lord Horder. Dr Inge in his *Christian Ethics and Modern Problems* takes a more cautious line than Canon Green, stating that he would welcome a modification of the Christian law which prohibits suicide in all circumstances, to allow of euthanasia. Dr Inge does clearly show that he considers euthanasia as a branch of suicide, and falling under the same moral heading. He admits, however, that he is inconsistent in hoping that if he was attacked by a painful illness he would have patience to wait for the end, and he would not want anyone near and dear to him to do otherwise.

There seems to me to be little doubt that euthanasia is in fact suicide, and that it is carried out by the hand of another makes no difference to the moral issues involved. But in these days merely to state that some course of action is contrary to Christian ethics carries little weight, or may even predispose the opinion of many in its favour. Neither of the two arguments demolished by Canon Green would be in the forefront of popular argument on the matter to-day. Nevertheless there is something to be said to reinforce them. There is a strong and growing feeling that the taking of human life in any way is wrong, a feeling that is not confined to professing Christians. Capital punishment has come under heavy fire quite lately, and is still a very open question. Equally one finds many intelligent people who hold that the taking of human life in war as a method of imposing one's will upon another body of people is outmoded, to say the least of it. This is not the place to examine the pros and cons of either of these thorny problems, but it can at least be asked whether the adding of a third set of circumstances in which it is lawful to take life is really a progressive step or not.

It must be admitted that civilized opinion is almost universally opposed to the idea that suffering is sent by God to be endured and not avoided, but when Canon Green puts euthanasia on the same level as the administering of anaesthetics he is surely begging the whole question. Obviously if anaesthetics are wrong all medicine, which is designed to alleviate human suffering, is wrong also. No sensible person could be found to maintain such a position. The whole repugnance to euthanasia derives precisely from the point that it is not a true part of medicine at all, but its negation.

The most formidable objections to euthanasia, however, seem to me to lie in the realm of practical consequences. Granted that a Bill might become law that made it legal under careful safeguards, can one suppose that it would be allowed to rest there, or even that it

would be able to rest there? For the answer to this we must face the actual facts of the doctor-patient relationship as it exists to-day on the ordinary level. It would be little or no exaggeration to say that no patient nowadays is allowed to suspect that the illness is at all serious, and only in exceptional cases to have any inkling of what the illness is at all. This process of keeping the patient in ignorance is most advanced in the hospitals. From my own experience of visiting the sick, I know full well that seriously ill people either are told nothing of their malady or are told that they have something trivial the matter with them. And it must be admitted that the ordinary patient frequently doesn't want to know what is the matter, or is perfectly satisfied to be told that it is something a little wrong with the stomach, or the liver, or the bowels. If there has to be an operation, it is an operation—or as they say in my part of the world, they have to be "cut"—but they are completely incurious about what is going to be done inside; it is a miraculous process which will restore them to health, and that is all that matters. And what is true of the hospitals is becoming increasingly true of the general practitioners. Generally overworked, they have no time to discuss their diseases with the bulk of their patients, who are perfectly satisfied if they have a bottle of medicine or packet of tablets without the least idea of what they are or why they will do good.

Now, does anybody suppose that this advancing conspiracy of silence can be suddenly put into reverse in order to allow euthanasia to be carried out under the ideal conditions in which it is advocated? Would anybody fancy asking a seriously ill patient, secretly terrified but taking part in the general make-believe that the doctors have the situation completely under control, quite suddenly to decide whether he or she prefers to go on suffering or would rather end it once and for all? It would require more moral courage to put the question than most of us could summon up. What would almost inevitably happen is that both the asking of the question and the taking of the decision would be found to be so painful for ordinary folk that a modification of the law would be called for by which the decision could be taken by the patient's relatives, and the sufferer be spared from making the terrible choice and from knowing that there was no hope. From this it would be an easy step to say that the relatives were not really the people best qualified to decide, but the matter was one for the doctors themselves, who would then resume the same relationship to the patient that they are now coming to adopt. Having gone so far, the next logical step would be to eliminate all bad risks, chronic sick and mentally deficient persons who at present occupy so many hospital beds and the time and energy of so large a proportion of the medical resources of a country, in order to concentrate on those who seemed more promising cases. All these steps would follow quite logically and I think inevitably from the first, though there would be many both among professing Christians and not least among the medical profession who would oppose them and be horrified by them. They could all be justified by the same plea as the first, that they were designed to prevent useless suffering.

We are driven back on to one of the basic principles of morals, that an action which is fundamentally wrong can never be justified by the supposed good consequences which will flow from it. The essential quality of wrongness will always come to light again in the sequence of events, however little it may be foreseen or intended. The prohibition of suicide is an ultimate that cannot be modified or got round, as is the prohibition of murder.

It might be worth considering, in conclusion, whether there are really so many cases in which euthanasia is the most merciful course of action as casual discussion of the matter often suggests. Modern drugs for the alleviation of suffering are very effective, and it is only in the rarest cases that one will see a sufferer in agony which nothing can assuage. When this does happen, it is a hundred to one that the pain is allowed to continue because the chance of recovery is still good, and to administer a larger dose of narcotic would reduce it. When there is really no hope, few doctors would, I think, have grave qualms of conscience or consider that they were contravening the terms of their medical oath if they ordered a sufficiently large amount to dull the agony, even if it did involve the risk of shortening by a few minutes or a few hours the final fight for life. It may seem a casuistical quibble, but there seems to me to be all the difference in the world between such an action, which merely risks slightly accelerating a process that has already begun, and the deliberate and cold-blooded decision to put to death, even by his own request, somebody who is mortally ill indeed but not moribund. One may hazard a guess that the former course has been taken a great many times, and it will be far better if this continues than for the whole principle of the preservation of life to be brought in question.

D. I. Luard.

The Theology of Henry and Thomas Vaughan

A Memorial Sermon preached before members of the Brecknock Society and others in the parish church of Llansantffraed on Low Sunday, 1952.[1]

Rom. 8. 18–23

Henry Vaughan died on St George's Day in 1695. Shakespeare also died—and is commonly believed to have been born—on St George's Day; and it is especially appropriate that England's greatest poet should be remembered on the day of her patron saint. But it is not inappropriate that the greatest Welsh master of English verse, who enriched English poetry from the store of his native Welsh poetic

[1] Page references in the following footnotes are to the Oxford edition of the Works of Henry Vaughan, edited by L. C. Martin, and to the first editions of Thomas Vaughan's treatises. The titles of the latter have been abbreviated. I have treated "The Poetry of Henry Vaughan, Silurist" in an essay contributed to the *Journal of the Historical Society of the Church in Wales* (vol. I, 1947, pp. 112–40) and reprinted in my *Cultural Revolution of the Seventeenth Century* (Dobson, 1951, pp. 121–61).

tradition, should likewise have passed to his rest on that day. And it is fitting, for a deeper reason than that of chronology, that we should remember him at Eastertide and in the spring of the year. Plant growth was for Vaughan a favourite symbol of the risen life in the Body of Christ:

> Dear, secret *Greenness*! nurst below
> Tempests and windes, and winter-nights,
> Vex not, that but one sees thee grow,
> That *One* made all these lesser lights. . . .
>
> Then bless thy secret growth, nor catch
> At noise, but thrive unseen and dumb;
> Keep clean, bear fruit, earn life and watch
> Till the white winged Reapers come!
>
> (*The Seed growing secretly*)[1]

Vaughan's treatment of the natural order has frequently been misunderstood. Because his religious poetry is full of references to flowers and trees and birds, and generally to the sights and sounds of the countryside, it has been too readily assumed by some critics that he sat lightly to the dogmas of Christianity; his attitude has been confused with that sentimental nature-worship which a good many people, in the last century and the earlier decades of this, tended to regard as an enlightened improvement upon our traditional belief. But Henry Vaughan, looking upon his native Breconshire with loving eyes,[2] understood what he saw, primarily in terms of Christian dogma, and secondarily in relation to the Hermetic philosophy, that esoteric form of Neoplatonism which he shared with—and probably to a great extent derived from—his twin brother Thomas, once rector of this parish.

It is unnatural for twins to be separated, and this seems a proper occasion to plead for justice to the memory of Thomas Vaughan. His Neoplatonic speculations tread dangerously near the brink of heresy—indeed, at times he oversteps the mark, as in his assertion of the pre-existence of human souls. The modern reader is perhaps more offended by his strange and wild ideas in fields now covered by sober scientific inquiry: his queer cosmological theories and the mumbo-jumbo of his cryptic hints at the marvels of alchemy. Much of this is sorry stuff: we have its progeny to-day in odd theosophistical religions and the nostrums of healers unrecognized by the British Medical Association. Even in his own day Thomas Vaughan would have been regarded as something of a crank. Yet behind all the clutter of dubious ideas he held firmly to one clear and fundamental truth. Against the degenerate Aristotelians of the day, against the Galenists, and against Descartes—whom he picturesquely characterizes as "a *whim* and a *wham*, without one *why* or

[1] P. 511.

[2] Vaughan's family history and the influence upon him of his Breconshire setting can be studied in H. E. Hutchinson's *Henry Vaughan: A Life and Interpretation* (Clarendon Press, 1947). Since my writing this paper, further interesting details of family history, antiquities, and local lore have been educed and discussed in a broadcast lecture by E. W. Williamson, Bishop of Swansea and Brecon (published by the B.B.C., January 1953).

wherefore"[1]—against all those influences, that is, that were to produce in the following centuries a mechanistic theory of the universe, he maintained that nature is no mere mechanical process but is alive with the Spirit of God: "For though his *full-ey'd* Love shines on nothing but *Man*, yet every thing in the World is in some measure directed for his Preservation by a *spice* or *touch* of the *first Intellect*. For he is seated *above all his Creatures*, to *hatch* as it were, and cherish them with *living Eternall Influences* which daily and hourely proceed from him" (*Anima Magica Abscondita*).[2] To-day, when scientists are substituting an organic for a mechanistic view of nature, and theologians are returning to a proper understanding of the doctrine of creation, we can better appreciate the rearguard action fought by the brothers Vaughan against a crudely materialistic science and the beginnings of deistical theology. The errors and absurdities in the works of Thomas Vaughan are less important than their underlying truth. And if only a few scholars can be expected to sift out the truth from the abundant nonsense in Thomas's prose treatises, we have in his brother Henry's poetry a lovely distillation of his best thought. For with Henry Vaughan the Hermetic philosophy, though present, no longer obtrudes as propaganda: it is merely the intellectual framework for a mystical contemplation of nature which, like all true mysticism, is self-authenticated. Nature is apprehended as alive in God, returning to God the worship which is the creature's joyous duty and the Creator's due:

> heark! In what Rings
> And *Hymning Circulations* the quick world
> Awakes and sings;
> The rising winds,
> And falling springs,
> Birds, beasts, all things
> Adore him in their kinds.
> Thus all is hurl'd
> In sacred *Hymnes*, and *Order*, The great *Chime*
> And *Symphony* of nature.
>
> (*The Morning-watch*)[3]

Fundamental to the thought of both Henry and Thomas Vaughan is the passage from St Paul which I have taken for my text, and which seems to express belief in a cosmic fall and redemption. Subhuman nature was somehow unwillingly involved in the fall of man and now, redeemed with him, awaits its final glorification, together with the glorified bodies of the elect, at the Last Day. Thomas, who from quotations would appear to have been familiar with the mystical approach to nature in such medieval writers as Hugh of St Victor and Ramon Lull, goes back to the eighth chapter of Romans and the words of our text:

> *For the Creature was made subject to Vanitie, not willingly, but by Reason of him, who hath subjected the same in hope. Because the Creature itself also shall be delivered from the Bondage of Corruption, into the Glorious Liberty of the Children of God.* Here by the *Creature* he understands not *Man*, but the *inferior species*, which he distinguisheth from the

[1] *Man-Mouse*, p. 114. [2] Pp. 13–14. [3] Pp. 424.

Children of God, though he allows them *both* the *same Liberty*. But this is more plaine out of the subsequent Texts, where he makes a clear *Difference* between *Man,* and the *whole Creation. For we know* (saith he) *that the whole Creation groaneth and travaileth together in paine untill now. And not only They, but our selves also, which have the first fruits of the spirit, even we our selves groane within our selves, waiting for the Adoption, to wit, the Redemption of our Body.* Here we see the *first Fruits of* the *spirit,* referred to *Man,* and why not some *second subordinat fruits of it* to the *Creatures in General?* for as they were *cursed* in the *Fall* of *Man,* for *Man's sake,* so it seems in his *Restitution* they shall be also *blessed* for *his sake. (Magia Adamica)*[1]

And in *Silex Scintillans* Henry, quoting Romans 8. 19 in Beza's Latin version, exclaims with envy of the subhuman creatures, for they, though fallen through man's fault, have not his perverse will and always watch and expect their final glory:

I would I were a stone, or tree,
Or flowre by pedigree,
Or some poor high-way herb, or Spring
To flow, or bird to sing!
Then should I (tyed to one sure state,)
All day expect my date;
But I am sadly loose, and stray
A giddy blast each way;
O let me not thus range!
Thou canst not change.[2]

This is a far cry from nineteenth-century nature-worship. Instead of deriving their religion from their private feelings about nature, the Vaughans interpret and understand nature in terms of an already accepted dogmatic system, the scheme of Christian revelation. (Indeed, Thomas will not accept any purely natural theology, such as St Thomas Aquinas derived from Aristotle, but insists that all religious ideas, even those of paganism, are but memories, however perverted, of an originally revealed truth.)

Not only is the Vaughans' understanding of nature sufficiently remote from sentimental nature-worship, but it is curiously in line with a number of interrelated trends in theology to-day. To emphasize our human participation in the natural order and to treat our redemption in Christ as a cosmic fact is the contemporary theologian's answer to the problems of a world threatened with destruction by the godless "scientific" exploitation of the past three centuries. The exploitation of nature by a science divorced from religion is the mode in which to-day we most clearly recognize the fall of man, and we are urged to submit ourselves again to God's sovereignty over all life, to admit our creaturely limitations and to abide by that natural law which is the law of God for man in his relation to nature, and without which we can only run headlong to destruction. Partially obscured by the Fall, the due relationship of man to nature and to God was republished and enabled to grow more intimate and glorious through the redemption wrought by the Incarnate Word. Thomas Vaughan distinguished between those sciences which "proceeded from the *Seed* of *Cain,* who in *Action* was a *Murtherer*" and the true

[1] P. 16. [2] P. 432.

Art of nature which was revealed to Adam and the Patriarchs: "To be short, there is no Vanity to the Vanitie of Sciences, I mean the Inventions, and their Professors, which produce nothing *true* and *Natural*, but *Effects* either *false*, or in their *Ends* corrupt and *Violent*. . . . Give me an Art then, that is a perfect intire *Map* of the *Creation*, that can lead me directly to the *Knowledge* of the true *God*. . . ." (*Magia Adamica*)[1] Such a pronouncement in the year 1650 has almost the nature of prophecy. "The *Laws* of the *Resurrection* are founded upon *those* of the *Creation*, and those of *Regeneration* upon those of *Generation*," he says later in the same treatise, "for in *all these* God works upon *one*, and the *same Matter*, by one and the *same spirit*."[2] From a similar standpoint Henry Vaughan treats poetically the great dogmas of the faith enshrined in the festivals of the Christian year, recurring most notably to the theme of resurrection, which, with St Paul and the Greek Fathers, he envisages not only as a future event but as a process now operative everywhere:

> For a preserving spirit doth still passe
> Untainted through this Masse,
> Which doth resolve, produce, and ripen all
> That to it fall.[3]

Nature is sacramentally interpreted as both signifying and actually embodying the mysterious operations of the Holy Spirit. The sacraments of the Church are representative and give the key to a proper understanding of the whole created universe. This is a commonplace of modern sacramental theology, but it is also to be found in the seventeenth century and not least in the writings of the Vaughans:

> The main *Motives*, which have occasion'd the present *Rents*, and *Divisions* of the *Church*, are the *Ceremonies* and *Types* used in it. For without Controversie the *Apostles* instituted, and left behind them certaine *Elements* or *Signs*, as *Water*, *Oile*, *Salt* and *Lights*, by which they signified unto us some great, and reverend *Mysteries*. But our *Reformers* mistaking these things for superstitious, turn'd them all out of Doores. But verily it was ill done. . . . (*Magia Adamica*)[4]

And with Henry Vaughan, in *The Feast*, the Blessed Sacrament is addressed, in a truly primitive and patristic fashion, as the medicine of immortality:

> O drink and bread
> Which strikes death dead,
> The food of mans immortal being!

And in a later stanza there is a wonderful interpenetration of the Sacrament, the human soul, and the natural order:

> O quickning showers
> Of my Lords blood
> You make rocks bud
> And crown dry hils with wells & flowers![5]

Here the sacred Blood of the Sacrament is figured as life-giving rain, and the receiving soul as the rocks and hills which blossom at its touch. The Blessed Sacrament is thus, surely, by implication, related

[1] P. 28. [2] P. 60. [3] *Resurrection and Immortality*, p. 401.
[4] P. 6. [5] P. 535.

to the restoration of nature in the new heaven and new earth at the consummation of the age. We hear a good deal to-day of "realized eschatology", the New Testament teaching that the Church is, here and now, and above all in the Holy Communion, transported into the life to come, while at the same time still awaiting its final translation into glory. This is the meaning of our text: we have the first-fruits and here and now anticipate the glory which, none the less, is still to be revealed. It is an aspect of our faith which is perhaps insisted on most strongly in times of social disturbance and religious persecution: it was so in the primitive Church; it is so to-day; and we must remember that the bulk of the Vaughans' writings were composed when the Great Rebellion had come upon our country and the dictator Cromwell had driven the Church underground, so that the faithful received the consolations of their religion in secret and often at some hazard to their liberty if not their lives. Thomas Vaughan was ejected from this parish for his loyalty to the Church; Henry served in the cause of Church and King. So they looked forward to the New Jerusalem, "That shady City of Palme trees,"[1] and in looking away from the sad spectacle of a Church outwardly in bonds they sought in nature not just escape but a prefiguring of future glory. Nature itself was valued by them not so much for its appearance as for its sacramental significance: seen in the light of Revelation it shadowed forth in its constant self-renewal that final transmutation into glory for which it, together with the elect, groaned and travailed in earnest expectation:

> And as for the fresh lustre and brightness wherewith, as is commonly thought, the Heavens shall be renewed at the last day, as a garment by the turning is changed and by changing refreshed, it may be well by the making them more resplendent then now they are, or ever at any time were since their first Creation, not by the scowring of contracted rust, but by adding a new gloss and augmentation of glory.

So Thomas speculated in his *Natural History*.[2] And Henry exclaims at the end of *Silex Scintillans*:

> Arise, arise!
> And like old cloaths fold up these skies,
> This long worn veyl: then shine and spread
> Thy own bright self over each head,
> And through thy creatures pierce and pass
> Till all becomes thy cloudless glass,
> Transparent as the purest day
> And without blemish or decay,
> Fixt by thy spirit to a state
> For evermore immaculate.[3]

To-day we give thanks for the life and work of these two brothers, the poet and the priest. As they both loved to figure forth as light the glory of God, let us pray that they may rest in his eternal light and that we and they together may come in the fullness of time to that "state For evermore immaculate" to which they so earnestly aspired. And let us learn from them a true reverence for the order of God's creation, not holding it apart from the Creator, as an idol, but seeing

[1] *The Retreate*, p. 419. [2] Pp. 16–17. [3] *L'Envoy*, p. 542.

in all natural things the imprint of the hand of God. "I am One," said Thomas, "that stands up for a *true Naturall knowledge*, grounded as *Nature is*, on Christ Jesus, who is the true *Foundation* of all things visible, and *Invisible*". (*Anima Magica Abscondita*)[1] "But life," said Henry,

> But life is, what none can express,
> *A quickness, which my God hath kist.*[2]

S. L. Bethell.

Studies in Texts

1 Cor. 11. 2–16

The usual summary of the purpose of this section is, "Why women must pray and prophesy veiled". I hope to show that it ought to be: "Why women must not pray and prophesy at all"—that is, in public worship.

The argument runs as follows. A man must prophesy with his head uncovered (4). Indeed, everyone must. Now, if a woman prophesies with her head uncovered she dishonours her head (5). Therefore she must not prophesy. But there is a further reason. If she is to prophesy she must be uncovered, and that involves (horrid thought) being shorn of her hair, for her hair is a covering, and that must go, too (5, 15). For a woman to be shorn is a shameful thing. Therefore, she must be covered. And therefore she cannot prophesy.

Moreover, a covering on the head is a sign of lowly estate. A man, being the image and glory of God, must not be veiled, whereas a woman, being one stage lower down the scale, must be veiled (7-9). In addition to this, headgear is a sign of ownership. The woman's veil indicates that she belongs to the man. Without a covering she might be regarded by angels as unattached and available for their lusts. But the *human* male and the *human* female are complementary, essential to each other and only to each other (10-12).

With 13 we are back at the original argument: everyone will agree that a woman ought not to be shorn. Well, that proves that she may not prophesy. Everyone agrees that God has given women long hair for adornment. That proves that God does not wish them to prophesy.

F. C. Synge.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. J. O. Cobham is Principal of the Queen's College, Birmingham, and an Hon. Canon of Derby.

Père Bouyer is a member of the French Oratory.

The Rev. D. I. Luard is Vicar of Kirkstall, Leeds.

Mr Bethell is a Lecturer in English Literature at University College, Cardiff.

The Rev. F. C. Synge is Warden of St Paul's College, Grahamstown, South Africa.

[1] P. 20.

[2] *Quickness*, p. 538.

CORRESPONDENCE

"THE EXTENSION OF THE INCARNATION"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

In his search for the earliest use of the phrase "extension of the Incarnation" as a description of the Church, Professor Hendry might find it interesting to consider the possible influence of an English theologian of some distinction, whose work antedates Bishop Gore's Bampton Lectures by nearly forty years. In his *Doctrine of the Incarnation* (London, 1848), pp. 334, 410, Robert Isaac Wilberforce cites Jeremy Taylor's application of the term to the Eucharist, while in his *Doctrine of Holy Baptism* (London, 1850), p. 9, he himself applies it to the Sacraments in general. Since his whole theological synthesis is founded on the mutual implication of the Incarnation, the Church, and the Sacraments, it is not surprising to find him going on to write (in 1853): "Because the mystical Body of the Lord is the extension of His Body natural, does the Church itself become a part of the Eucharistic sacrifice" (*The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, London, 1885, p. 292). This is at least a step towards the use of the entire phrase to describe the Church.

The Bishop Paddock Lectures for 1890, given by H. Tully Kingdon (1835-1907), then Bishop Coadjutor of Fredericton, New Brunswick, and published as *God Incarnate* (New York, 1890), may shed a little more light on the immediate background of Bishop Gore's language. Kingdon refers to Taylor (p. 137) in his discussion of the Eucharist, and uses the idea in a more general way in a number of passages (e.g., pp. 132 f., 171, 187). The two most interesting texts may be worth quoting: (i) "All sacraments and sacramentals are, as it were, 'extensions of the Incarnation' to us while we are in this present world" (p. 169); (ii) "By the operation of the same Spirit the Incarnation is continually extended to the individual members of the Church, by means of the Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood" (p. 202).

Sincerely yours,
EUGENE R. FAIRWEATHER.

TRINITY COLLEGE,
TORONTO.

COSIN'S HOURS OF PRAYER

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

It is hardly accurate to describe "God be in my head" (THEOLOGY, No. 392, p. 56) as traditional English. It occurs in French *Horae* of the fifteenth century, e.g. *Brit. Mus.* I.A. 40846:

Jesus soit en ma teste et mon entendement.
Jesus soit en mes yeuex et mon regardement.
Jesus soit en ma bouche et en mon parlement.

Jesus soit en mon cueur et en mon pensement
Jesus soit en ma Vie et mon trespassement.
(*pour Anthoine Verard*, 1497?)

Yours truly,
MAURICE FROST.

THE VICARAGE,
DEDDINGTON,
OXFORD.

[Mr Porter writes: "Cosin's version of 'God be in my head' derives (with slight alteration) from the anonymous English version which he probably obtained from the Sarum *Enchiridion*, a manual from which he seems to have also derived several other items in *The Devotions*. The verse will be found on the title page of the *Hurdouyn* editions of 1530 and 1533 of the *Enchiridion*.

"The French version is, however, of interest. Perhaps there are other vernacular versions as well."]

ST MARK'S GOSPEL

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR MR EDITOR,

I notice in your issue of last October a rather severe criticism of my *Primitive Christian Calendar* by Dr Casey. As he has dealt some sledge-hammer blows, I wonder whether I may be allowed the privilege of making some comments and corrections, as an erroneous impression of my work might be given by his article?

I do not claim to have anything like his learning. There are large gaps in my reading, no doubt, as he surmises, but I did read the pages of von Soden which he mentions (p. 366, note 6, of his article). I did not find them specially helpful, however, and that is why I did not refer to them. I am afraid my book cannot claim to have complete references to all the literature on every subject which it handles. Far from it.

But we all make our mistakes. We will not delay over the heretic "Valentus" in Dr Casey's article, p. 366, note 4; that is an error in proof-reading which might occur to any of us. I am more perplexed by the remark on the same page, in which he is summarizing part of my book, and says on my behalf that "*there are two ancient systems of chapter-divisions, one of which is found in* B.א.579". If this is really my position, how can he say in note 6 that I "*make the erroneous statement that Sinaiticus shows 'no sign of chapter-divisions'*?"; for Sinaiticus and א are identical. The fact seems to be that the symbol א has crept into his first statement unawares and is "*erroneous*". And it is perfectly true to say that the text of Mark in Sinaiticus (or א) shows no sign of chapter-divisions in the sense in which I was using the word in my book; it has the Eusebian "canons" which I expressly distinguished from them (p. 23).

More serious, however, from my point of view, is his error on pp. 368–9. I pointed out in my book that the structure of Mark 1–10

was determined by three important episodes, each of which took place in connexion with a Mountain in Galilee. The *Second Mountain*, he says, "*is unhappily missing from Mark, though Carrington fails to note this interesting omission, and supplies it in the feeding of the five thousand from John 6. 3*". I do not know how Dr Casey comes to make this inexplicable error, for the "second mountain" is happily *present* in Mark 6. 46: see p. 95 of my book. The "*interesting omission*" exists entirely in his imagination. I give the reference to it in my book, I print it in the text (from the Revised Version), I can do no more. It is true that the mountain is not mentioned in Mark till after the five thousand are fed, but presumably it was there all the time.

I regret, Mr Editor, that I am obliged to write this letter. I fear that Dr Casey may have given the impression that my book is an inaccurate, unreliable, and worthless composition, so that I am bound to ask you to print these simple corrections of his errors. The burden of his article is that he disagrees with my opinions, which it is perfectly right and proper for him to do. He finds them "*wholly improbable*" and "*extremely unlikely*"; and so they appeared to me when they were first suggested to me by the evidence. So I can sympathize with him there. But in this life it is the improbable and the unlikely that so often occur; and the consensus of the evidence convinced me that it had occurred in this case.

Yours, etc.,
PHILIP QUEBEC.

BISHOPTHORPE,
QUEBEC.
5 *January* 1953.

Dr Casey replies as follows:

"Archbishop Carrington raises two points of fact in connexion with my review of his *Primitive Christian Calendar*: (1) the survival of traces in ℵ of the system of chapter divisions found in B 579, and (2) the second mountain in his triad of mountains which, he believes, conditions the structure of Mark 1–10.

"(1) In the sentence of my review which he quotes I make no statement on his behalf but repeat the view maintained by A. Schmidtke, *Die Evangelien eines alten Unzialcodex*, Leipzig, 1903. This monograph, he says (*Christian Calendar*, p. 24), was commended to him by Mr T. C. Skeat of the British Museum, but he gives no evidence either in his book or in his Reply of having consulted it. The relevant passage is as follows, "Hinsichtlich der Ausstattung der hesychianischen Ausgabe verstärkt Ol die Berechtigung, die ausser B und Ξ nun auch von ihm gebotene Zerlegung der Evangelien in 170, 62, 152 und 80 Kapitel als Eigengut der Textgruppe überhaupt in Anspruch zu nehmen. Man darf diese Förderung um so unbedenklicher stellen, als auch die Textgliederung von ℵ diese Kapiteleinteilung durchscheinen lässt und die übrigen Vertreter der Recension durch die Aufnahme der die synoptischen Bedürfnisse bequem befriedigenden, rasch populär gewordenen eusebianischen Sektionen und der vulgären Kapitel mit Inhaltsangaben die Preisgebung der

ursprünglichen Gliederung selbst erklären" (pp. xxvii–xxviii). More detailed discussion of the evidence is found in Schmidtke, op. cit., pp. xxix ff., and in *Theologisches Literaturblatt*, 1903, 44. Attention is drawn with approval to Schmidtke's view by Bousset, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1903, and by Lake, *Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus: The New Testament*, p. xxi. The problem has nothing to do with the presence of the Eusebian canons in ℵ.

"(2) I fear that I cannot concede the Archbishop his second mountain. As he says, it "is not mentioned by Mark till after the five thousand are fed, but, presumably, it was there all the time". It may have been there, but the point is that it was not only not associated but explicitly dissociated from the feeding. In Mark, when the miracle was over and the crowds fed, Jesus dismissed the multitude and retired to the mountain, sending his disciples away over the lake by boat. How this feeding can be described as "the episode of the second mountain" is baffling. In John 6. 3, as I observed, the feeding took place on the mountain to which in Mark 6. 46 Jesus retires after the miracle has been performed and the incident closed. It is not clear what ὄρος means in Mark 6. 46. The location intended is uncertain. (George Adam Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, 15th edition, pp. 440, 457–8; cf. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Marc*, 15e ed., Paris, 1929, pp. 165–6. F. M. Abel, *Géographie de la Palestine*, Paris, 1938 II, p. 280.) Is it a mountain or merely the plateau rising behind the lake shore?"

BOOK REVIEWS

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings. By J. A. Montgomery. Edited by H. S. Gehman. T. and T. Clark. 35s.

The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings: A Reconstruction of the Chronology of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah. By E. R. Thiele. University of Chicago Press. $6.00.

The late Professor Montgomery's long-awaited commentary on Kings (in the series of International Critical Commentaries) is a magnificent addition to the available literature on the history of Israel. It has been most competently edited by the author's former pupil, Professor Gehman, who has enriched it with many up-to-date references to literature, with a chronological table of his own, and with the requisite indices. To him all Old Testament scholars will feel deeply grateful. It can be said without hesitation that this new volume will take its place in a notable series of volumes as on a level with the best we have had, and will for long be regarded as indispensable. The value of the book lies mainly on the textual and archaeological sides. Many pages of the Introduction are devoted to a discussion of the versions, and the textual notes in small print at the end of each section of the exposition are exhaustive. On the archaeological side the treatment is superb, though, of course, the specialists

will inevitably detect omissions and find details to criticize. Elaborate references to the relevant literature will be found most useful.

One or two points may be mentioned. On p. 43 it is said that "the literary brilliance of the earlier Historical Story disappeared promptly under the magnificent Solomon". This would imply that we may be certain that the remarkable Court History of David was written not later than the end of his reign. The judgment is in curious contrast to that of von Rad, who emphasizes the humanism of the age of Solomon. The discussions of Necho's operations in Palestine and Syria about the time of the death of Josiah (e.g. the treatment by Professor Noth in his *Geschichte Israels* and by Professor Rudolph in his commentary on Jeremiah) are not taken into account.

On the literary-critical side there should perhaps have been a more serious discussion of the problem of Deuteronomy which is so vital for the whole book. Although Noth's *Ueberlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien I* is listed, his original and illuminating treatment of the historical books is not taken account of. Perhaps it was not to be expected that it would. To that extent this commentary belongs to an era which is closing. It is disappointing to find that there is so little reference to the Davidic monarchy. The work of L. Rost in this connexion is overlooked.

In general, however, one must be grateful for the amazing wealth of good things in this book and not be ungracious about what the distinguished author did not feel called upon to give. It is a commentary in the grand style, on the production of which the publishers and the editor are to be warmly congratulated.

Professor Thiele's book, in spite of its unfortunate title and its exorbitant price, deserves to be widely studied by all who are interested in the vexed question of Hebrew chronology and are not afraid of a piece of sustained reasoning. Many attempted solutions have been offered in the past and Professor Thiele's will doubtless not be the last. But it deserves the most serious consideration if only for the fascinating detective work it contains. Actually it represents a most gallant and ingenious attempt to take the Hebrew (Massoretic) chronology, both regnal datings and synchronisms, quite seriously. It contrasts sharply, for example, with the work in this field of Professor Albright, who has recognized the value of Professor Thiele's views but differs fundamentally from him on the reliability of the Massoretic data. The argument of the book is that, if we recognize an initial difference between the way in which the two Hebrew kingdoms calculated the length of a reign and a subsequent agreement on the Jewish practice, preceded by a short interval during which Judah, in consequence of Israelite dominance, adopted the original northern practice; if, further, we allow for a certain number of co-regencies, a possible reason for all of which can be surmised; and if, finally, we admit a few slight inaccuracies like the statement in 2 Chron. 16. 1 and a mistaken antedating of several reigns in 2 Kings 17. 1; 18.1; 9 and 10, all the chronological evidence for the period of the parallel kingdoms is self-consistent and harmonizes

with the absolute dating for certain events furnished by the Assyrian Eponym List. The astonishing thing is that the author makes good his contention. It will, of course, be argued against him that some of the discrepancies might more plausibly be accounted for by errors of transmission and by late calculations of a scribe than by postulating the considerable number of co-regencies which Professor Thiele finds necessary. Pekah's supposed sequestration of the regnal periods of his two immediate predecessors is not exactly easy to accept. Yet the numbers given do fit the theory amazingly well.

Of very great convenience is the appendix, which contains the Assyrian *Limmu* or Eponym List and the relevant part of the Canon of Ptolemy, which make it possible for the reader to follow the argument of the author more intelligently. Professor Albright has complained that the Canon of Menander in Josephus (*Contra Apionem* and *Antiquities*), which gives the list of the Tyrian kings, is not made use of and maintains that it confirms his date of 922 for the death of Solomon as against Professor Thiele's date of 931. It should be noticed that Albright gets this support by accepting the traditional date 814 for the foundation of Carthage and the traditional number of forty years for Solomon's reign. He is not always so fond of tradition.

There is nothing startling about the main dates which Professor Thiele reaches. What is startling is his claim that the Biblical chronology of the Kings is almost completely self-consistent. It is interesting to note that Professor Thiele's dates for Hezekiah would make it impossible for him to have been the wonder-child of Isaiah 7.

Norman W. Porteous.

University of Edinburgh.

The Biblical Doctrine of Work. By Alan Richardson. S.C.M. Press. 5s.

This excellent little book "is the outcome of an inquiry initiated by the Study Department of the World Council of Churches" (p. 7), in preparation for the work of one of the Commissions of the forthcoming World Council at Evanston, Illinois, in 1954. Though it claims to be "the outcome of a genuinely ecumenical 'traffic in knowledge' ", and owes much to many eminent scholars and men of affairs, it bears on every page the stamp of the acute and accurate scholarship of its editor, Dr Alan Richardson.

The word "work" as used in the Bible "includes everything from the activity of God in the creation to the toil of the meanest slave" (p. 13). In creation God does not need by effort to overcome "the refractoriness of his material". Creation is *ex nihilo* and "God's word is the effective instrument of God's work" (p. 16). On the other hand, the Bible says little or nothing about human handiwork or achievement as "creative", largely because of the fear of idolatry, in which men worship the work of their hands.

The Hebrews, unlike the Greeks, never thought of daily work to

earn daily bread as degrading. "No stigma is attached to being a 'worker' in the Old Testament: on the contrary, it is expected that every man will have his proper work to do" (p. 23). Work is then "a necessary and indeed a God-appointed function of human life" (p. 23). Man cannot fulfil his function as a human being, made in the image of God, without work, and in the Sabbath his kinship with his Maker finds expression in rest as well as in work, but in rest after work.

"The myths of Genesis do not represent work as coming into being as a result of sin, but as part of the very intention of God in making the world and man" (p. 25). The rebellion against God acquires cosmic significance in the curse upon the earth; but the divine ordinance, as part of the Law of God for man's life, is not cancelled by man's sin, though much of human work is frustrated by that sin.

In the New Testament "*the* work of Jesus is not his work as craftsman, but as the redeemer of the world" (p. 31); and the New Testament writers "had hardly realized" that in the craftsman-status of Jesus "there was a truth of deep theological—much less sociological!—significance" (p. 31).

It is in the chapter on *Vocation in the New Testament* that most controversy will be aroused. The book will have none of the contention that *klesis* in 1 Cor. 7. 20 ff. can be applied to the "secular calling", as maintained by Luther and Calvin and their followers, and in our day expressed with characteristic pungency by Bishop K. E. Kirk: "Quite deliberately he (Paul) places these secular conditions and circumstances—the profession or status a man happens to be in at the time of his conversion—on the same spiritual level as that conversion itself. Each is a 'call' or 'calling' direct from God. . . ." (*The Vision of God*, p. 81). This book maintains "the frequently misapplied 1 Cor. 7. 20 f. ('Let each man abide in that calling wherein he was called; wast thou called being a slave . . .?') does not bid the Christian to remain in the *secular* 'calling' (e.g. that of a slave) in which he was when he became a believer, but to remain faithful to the *calling of God* by which he was brought out of heathen darkness into the light of the truth. The words *klēsis, ekklētoi, ekklēsia* have nothing to do with the secular occupations of the Christian disciple. God's call to us, which is always personal, comes to us in whatever situation or employment we may be found" (p. 36). But, after reference to Calvin's teaching, it goes on, "Though there is no parallel in the New Testament to the idea of vocation in the modern sense, it is assumed throughout the New Testament that daily work, so far from being a hindrance to Christian living, is a necessary ingredient in it" (pp. 38–9). Further reference might have been made to the aptness with which this passage, on Bishop Kirk's interpretation, fits into the teaching of Jesus in the parables. In limiting the use of 'call' to the 'work of salvation' and of 'calling' to 'work' within the Church" (p. 35), the book renders itself liable to the charge of reformulating the 'two-standards' doctrine in a peculiarly dangerous form, in which 'work' can never be more than an 'avocation'. The chief argument for the view of the Reformers (and Bishop Kirk) is

not any parallel use of 'call' and 'calling' in Epictetus or elsewhere, but its prophetic interpretation of certain vital features of the Gospel. Such an interpretation, implicit in the Gospels and even in St Paul himself, the writer accepts most convincingly in his chapter on *Christ the Fulfilment of the Ordinance of Work*. This is excellent in its treatment both of the dignity of labour in Christ's own example and in the loyalty of his disciples: "A workman's jacket was a fitting garment for the God whom the Biblical revelation had all along represented as himself a worker" (p. 48).

Disconcertingly again, we find the book says: "Its (the New Testament's) teaching about work has nothing to do with economic systems, political panaceas or sociological techniques. It cannot be handed out to masses or to classes: it is relevant only to Christian workers *one* by *one*, as each finds in Christ salvation from sin and the redemption of his whole life" (p. 50); but adds immediately, "Paradoxically it is relevant to every social structure in every age of history, precisely because it is 'irrelevant' to all of them" (p. 50); and goes on: "Human society as such is necessarily a hierarchic and not an equalitarian structure; social health consists in the responsible acceptance of the duties of one's position within the organism." Luther would add *in vocatione* and Calvin *per vocationem*, and both St Paul and Bishop Kirk would add Amen.

Space does not permit of any treatment of the invaluable chapters on *Leisure and Rest, Work and Justification, Work and Worship,* and *The Offering of Work*. Suffice it to say that this remarkable little book reaches its most profound thought on the last page: "Unlike the bread from heaven which Moses gave, the manna from the skies, the bread of the Eucharist is the product of the labour of men's hands" (p. 76). Let all concerned read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest this wholesome nourishment for mind and soul.

W. R. Forrester.

St Andrews.

The Origin and Development of Early Christian Church Architecture. By J. G. Davies. S.C.M. Press. 21s.

The Church of England, in spite of its veneration for the theology of the Fathers, has been strangely little influenced in its modern buildings by either the architecture or the liturgical lay-out of basilica churches. Modern Anglican churches built in this style are few in number, nor as architecture are they particularly distinguished. Yet a basilica church can look at home in the English scene—witness the seventh-century nave at Brixworth in Northamptonshire, an example of the basilica style at the end of its period and the finest piece of architecture left by the Anglo-Saxon Church. In the spaciousness, the purity of line and the luminous beauty of a church like Santa Sabina on the Aventine or San Apollinare in Classe, many elements in the Prayer Book services would be brought out, which pass unnoticed when these services are offered in Gothic buildings, whether medieval or revived. The basilica practice of

placing the altar on the chord of the apse or some way down the nave is convenient for Anglican worship, where audibility is so important and particularly when the celebrant takes the north or westward position. If a surpliced choir is placed between the altar and the people, this is far preferably done in the basilica manner in a low enclosure at the east end of the nave rather than in a separate structural chancel. The part played by the ambo in a basilica church, the progenitor alike of the pulpit, lectern and prayer desk, can teach us some useful lessons about giving these pieces of furniture their proper emphasis in a church without at the same time detracting from the importance of the altar.

One reason for the little influence exercised by the basilica style on the planning of churches in England is the lack hitherto of an ordered survey of the origin, development, and characteristics of the style. The relevant information has had to be extracted from articles in dictionaries and learned periodicals. Mr. Davies's book performs a most valuable service in providing such a survey. The history of the style is traced from the late third till the early seventh century; its best surviving remains, mostly in Greece, the Near East, and North Africa, are described with the accompaniment of plans. There is a useful discussion on the various theories that have been advanced on the origins of the style, in which incidentally the view that it is derived from the ordinary Roman dwelling-house is demolished. The book is buttressed by ample footnotes and an admirable bibliography; though one misses any reference to Robert Byron's classic description of St Sophia in his *Byzantine Achievement*. An excellent piece of work like Mr Davies's deserves better photographs; most of them are dull and lifeless, and bear little relation to the text.

Mr. Davies's book should be particularly read by all those who are in any way responsible for building new churches. We are accustomed to think of a church as a large room for the holding of services with small inconvenient vestries at one end. In a basilica church the room where the services were held was just one room amongst a number of others, which served for baptisms, confirmations, the instruction of catechumens, the storing of the possessions of the church, the keeping of its documents, and the housing of its clergy. It is such a plan of church with a number of separate rooms that will best serve the needs of the Church of England in the future, particularly on new housing estates.

G. W. O. Addleshaw.

York.

The English Church and Nation. By R. H. Malden. S.P.C.K. 25s.

The late Dean of Wells gave a series of lectures on English church history to the Wells theological students and others between 1945 and 1947, and these are here collected, together with a prefatory note by Canon C. H. Smyth and five appendices. In many ways the result is original and valuable: its range includes a good deal of political history, and although the more dramatic events in church

history are rather cursorily treated, fundamental problems such as religious toleration and the nature of the church are discussed at length. A convincing picture emerges of a *via media* arising not from compromise but from synthesis, a church to be served with enthusiasm as "the best contribution which we have made and can make to the general welfare of mankind". But there have been false developments as well as true; Mr Malden heads two of his medieval chapters with the ominous words "Parasitic Growths", and from time to time he utters anathemas reminiscent of the Crockford Prefaces. Thus the Saxons are said to be "savages, bent on destruction"; all but the earliest Gothic buildings have the touch of decadence, and the worship performed within them was but a "tropical jungle of ceremonial". In recent years the House of Laity is adjudged a failure, as are also the Roman Catholic hierarchy and the Anglo-Catholic movement. But whether enthusiastic or denunciatory the lectures are never tedious; if our interest flags it is revived by some significant piece of detail, as when we are told, for instance, that "Lollard" probably means "crooner" and "Pope" "daddy", or that Nidderdale shepherds still count their sheep in Welsh.

The lectures are lively and readable, but they are not in the technical sense a work of scholarship, as Canon Smyth observes. Certain sections in particular needed reconsideration in the light of current research, notably the accounts of Scholastic philosophy (self-contradictory if the generalizations are based on the work of the philosophers named) and of the Reformation (which incidentally leaves the motives of many of the reformers in obscurity). Occasionally comments are paradoxical, as when monks are supposed to have desired simpler services than parish priests, or when the church is said to have been emancipated from the State in the Reformation. And it should be added that "good King Henry of Windsor" was never canonized, and that something seems to have gone wrong with vital sentences on p. 244 and p. 364. In general it seems that the lectures cannot replace the standard histories of the Church of England (nor indeed had their author the slightest intention that they should), but they will provide a stimulating introduction to the subject both for the ordinand and for those general readers who find that in the more elaborate works it is difficult to see the wood for the trees.

M. F. Bond.

Windsor.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Coasts of the Country. An Anthology of prayer. Edited by Claire Kirchberger. Harvill Press. 15s.

Mystical treatises do not offer a ready field for the work of an anthologist. The author of *The Cloud of Unknowing* would seem to bar the path with his demand, by the authority of charity, that his book shall be read "all over" or not at all. Miss Kirchberger has, how-

ever, taken the risk and produced an interesting catena of passages from the English spiritual writers of the three centuries before the Reformation. Her material has been drawn from MS sources as well as the recognized masters of the period. Of the former, some is illuminating but some also extremely pedestrian. In their context they may have been moving; out of it they are altogether too scrappy.

The book is arranged to illustrate "the natural development of the life of Prayer and the Spirit", and in this there is at least the hint of a confusion. Spiritual writings are not mystical theology. They record the primary experience of which the other is only a convenient schematization, and Richard Rolle reminds us that "no man may set himself in any of these paths except he takes to that which God chose for him". The God chosen path leads every man to his own fulfilment in Christ. Though the ways are alike there is an essential individuality that this book's treatment tends to blur. It is perhaps significant of Miss Kirchberger's approach that before she embarks on her scheme she has three opening chapters entitled God our Father, our Lord, our Lady, but there is no mention of the Holy Spirit, the Lord of liberty.

M. Hare Duke.

London.

Return to Christianity. By Nels Ferré. S.C.M. Press. 5s.

Retreat from Christianity in the Modern World. By J. V. L. Casserley. Longmans. 12s. 6d.

Religion in the Modern World. Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.

Religion in the Modern World is a collection of lectures sponsored by the newly inaugurated "London School of Religion". The lecturers make a distinguished set of names, but the treatment of their vast subjects is necessarily so slight that they scarcely do themselves justice. The value of this symposium is doubtful. The aim of the "School" is that religion should be fairly and competently studied by as many people as possible. But there is little virtue in the study of "religion" as such. Certainly there is no attempt here at syncretism, except for Radhakrishnan's characteristic contribution. Some contributors speak as Christians (Raven's "Is there a Christian politics?"), while others uphold a generally theistic view (Viscount Samuel's "What is happening to religion to-day?"). Although many of these lectures are admirable in their way, this collection will assist an inquirer only if they goad him into clarifying this confusion.

Nels Ferré's little book is more challenging, although it is obscure why he calls it a "Return to Christianity", for plainly no Christianity such as he propounds has ever existed. In his first chapter, he not only dismisses science and modernism, but treats traditional Christianity with scorn. In their place he would put his own radical Christianity. "Every great reform in Christianity has come from going back to the root. But the reforms have not been radical enough." Ferré then discusses the relation of Christianity to the individual, the

Church and society. In his concern to make *agape* central in faith and life, he sits lightly to sacramentalism, and makes a definite distinction between the visible ecclesiastical institution and the invisible Church of all believers, many of whom he says are nauseated by traditional Christianity.

Professor Ferré writes with the fervour of a reformer and the acumen of a theologian. Much of what he says is good sense and inspiring reading. Yet for him the Church is no school for sinners but a home for saints. He is vitally concerned with the need for committed Christians: but he loses sight of the real problems of Christian living as he propounds for the élite yet another "essential Christianity".

Dr Casserley's book is much more penetrating. Writing with a fine sense of historical perspective, he has produced a first-rate work of contemporary analysis. His thesis is that there are, as always, two avenues of retreat from Christianity. The one is into irreligion, and here he analyses rationalism, the "scientific outlook" and atheistic humanism. The other road leads to "religion", either to mere natural religion, or the syncretism of comparative religion, or the pseudo-religions of political movements. After a fine analysis of "the ineptitude of modern theology", he considers the dilemmas of modern life and the inevitable tensions caused by a disintegrating culture. He then examines the "Retreat" not so much from the intellectual level, but as seen by the sociologist and the psychologist. Finally he vindicates his thesis that the retreat is a real retreat, whether it is viewed intellectually, or morally, or socially.

Dr Casserley does not pull his punches. His role is not so much the championship boxer but the prize fighter who takes on all who come into his intellectual ring. He does not knock out his opponents—there is no time for that—but he sends each one reeling as he turns to the next. Neither Professor Ferré nor the London School of Religion would last long in his booth. Dr Casserley pays much attention to his opponents' background and directs his blows almost entirely to their heads, whilst he keeps an undue guard over his own heart. For he does not take into consideration personal encounter with Christ and the place of the will in accepting him, nor does he seem aware of the intellectual offence of the Christian paradoxes. By Christianity he seems to mean "primarily a coherent and all-embracing system of thought". It is much more than that. However, Dr Casserley has chosen his own terms of reference, and within these he has succeeded brilliantly in his endeavour. He has brought together many things that needed saying and he has said them very well.

Christianity, he claims, plays no part in the life of modern post-Christian man because it plays no part in his inherited culture. In his analysis of anti-clericalism he makes the sociological distinction between the priest and the clergyman. He produces statistics to show that churches were built too late for the new population of the industrial revolution, although he is wrong to suggest that church building received its spiritual impulse primarily from the Oxford movement. He shows how the "Retreat" has been speeded by the

narrow anti-humanistic theologies of biblicists, and he brings evidence to support his thesis that irreligion itself is, psychologically considered, a neurosis.

Theologians may be pardoned for special interest in his chapter on "the ineptitude of modern theology". "Its distinguishing characteristic is the substitution of scholarship for thought." "Browning's grammarian could find a comfortable and congenial home in not a few of our places of theological learning." "No man ever became a good Christian by not being an intellectual." He holds that the domination of theology by the uninspiring period of the sixteenth century has had an unhealthy effect, but that Anglican theology has been helped by its devotion to the fathers of the early undivided church. Nevertheless, "a new theological boom is upon us". Planting himself firmly in the footsteps of Butler and Maurice, Dr Casserley strives for a new cultural synthesis. "In a Christian civilization this ceaseless search for cultural synthesis is the proper and inevitable burden of the Chritian philosopher and theologian." If that indeed is its proper aim, Dr Casserley has made no mean contribution.

Hugh Montefiore.

Westcott House,
Cambridge.

Recent Thought in Focus. By Donald Nicholl. Sheed and Ward. 15s.

The Language of Morals. By R. M. Hare. Geoffrey Cumberlege. 7s. 6d.

The Socratic. (Number 5.) Basil Blackwell. 4s.

We live in an age of the expert. But even the experts differ amongst themselves on matters of far-reaching concern to the ordinary man. Is it then possible for the intelligent inquirer to form a reasoned view for himself in such matters? It is the laudable aim of Donald Nicholl's book to assist "the general reader" in the performance of this difficult but necessary task. He recognizes at the outset that there is such a fundamental diversity among the experts of to-day, that the production of a twentieth-century "Summa" on the model of his hero St Thomas would be impossible, be your author never so wise. He therefore sets himself the lesser but useful task of testing the significance of the work of the experts by an examination of their methods of study. This is a highly commendable aim, but the resultant book cannot unfortunately be given the same unqualified commendation. The three main sections of the book are entitled "Modern Philosophy", "The Natural Sciences", and "Psychology"; it may be that it is altogether impossible to deal satisfactorily with so vast a field within the compass of 230 pages. But there is in addition evidence of certain underlying flaws which colour and spoil the whole approach of the book. The first is an apparent lack of humility; the opening sections of the book display a certain facetiousness at the expense of the experts (evidenced by a fondness for the exclamation-mark) which seems out of place in such a study. Secondly there is a

tendency to underestimate the significance and the real achievement of recent trends in thought. Is it really true that "If one puts together the two halves that are existentialism and logical positivism the resulting whole is not so very different from the traditional philosophy of St Thomas" (p. 142)? Thirdly there are signs that the lesson of Galileo has not yet been learnt. Is it true that a theory of parallel evolution from different pre-human stocks is automatically ruled out for Christians "because it is incompatible with the unity of the human race, which fell in Adam and is redeemed in Christ" (p. 185)? Thus although some of his criticisms show shrewd insight and are clearly expressed, the overall effect of the book is to irritate rather than to instruct. There is no index.

The Language of Morals is essentially the work of an expert; its field of investigation is severely restricted. It is a study of the logical use of ethical words. The author's thesis is that all evaluative language ("good", "right", "ought", etc., whether used in a strictly moral sense or not) is to be understood in terms of the guidance of choices, whether actual or hypothetical. This thesis is developed step by step with an admirable clarity both of thought and of expression. He deals, I think successfully, with the obvious objection that his theory is guilty of the naturalist fallacy in ethics. The result is a most satisfying and convincing book. Almost incidentally in the course of the argument, interesting light is shed on specific ethical problems. On p. 41 we have the observation that "no general principle can be self-evident which is to be of assistance in deciding particular questions about which we are in doubt". This is the conclusion of an interesting demonstration of the tautological character of all apparently self-evident general ethical laws. In another place (pp. 148–50), when distinguishing the evaluative and the purely descriptive uses of such words as "good", he has some interesting things to say about the way in which this ambiguity of our terminology may tend to accelerate a breakdown of moral standards. But these are attractive sidelights, brought in to illustrate the main argument of the book; the argument itself is often intricate but never obscure. It could be read without any background knowledge of philosophical study, though the significance of the book as a whole might not easily be evident apart from the recognition of its place in current philosophical debate.

For anyone who wishes to be "put into the picture" about that debate and in particular to consider the implication for theology of the linguistic school in philosophy, the fifth number of the *Socratic* is highly to be commended. It consists of papers read to the Socratic Club in Oxford, all of which deal in one way or another with the relation between theology and modern philosophy. Basil Mitchell's paper is an admirable statement of the issues involved, and I. M. Crombie's paper on "Theology and Falsification" is an interesting justification of theological language before the bar of the famous verification principle. The society and its publications are fulfilling a much needed function.

MAURICE WILES.

RIDLEY HALL,
CAMBRIDGE.

VOCATION. No. 2 of series "Religious Life". Essays translated from French. Blackfriars. 10s. 6d.

This book should be read by all Superiors of religious orders and by their novice-guardians. It examines how the vocation to the Religious Life was regarded in the earliest ages; how far one is obliged to follow it when recognized or suspected; and how it may indicate itself, whether to contemplative or to a "mixed" type of life. Results of a wide inquiry among Religious Institutes in France give some indication of the mistakes that may be, and sometimes are, made by communities in the reception and election of new members. At this point and elsewhere there is proper stress laid on the obligation of Superiors to regard the welfare of their order, as well as vocations claimed by postulants or novices.

Impediments (by Roman Canon Law) to entry upon the religious life are reviewed. Some negative criteria of vocation are discussed, and an inquiry begun as to the value of modern methods of psychological diagnosis (and treatment) for the discernment and encouragement of vocations.

There is little that is conclusive in this book, but much of practical assistance to those who have to test the vocations of postulants and novices.

L. D. HEPPENSTALL.

COMMUNITY OF THE HOLY NAME,
MALVERN LINK.

REASON AND ANTI-REASON IN OUR TIME. By Karl Jaspers. Translated by Stanley Godman. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

Professor Karl Jaspers is one of the most eminent of contemporary German thinkers, but his work has so far made no impression upon philosophical students here in England commensurable with what many, not confined to his fellow-countrymen, would claim for its intrinsic merit and importance. The present volume is a very competent translation of his *Vernunft und Widervernunft in unserer Zeit*, a series of three lectures delivered at Heidelberg University and published in Munich two years ago. It includes a bibliography of the author's writings to date, and is welcome as providing a further opportunity of acquainting English readers with the work of one who is generally regarded as in all respects outstanding among the somewhat variegated exponents of Existentialism.

Professor Jaspers' aim in these lectures is to examine, or rather to extol, Reason, or true philosophy, in contrast with the anti-reason of certain currently influential false philosophies. The first lecture, which selects Marxism and psychoanalysis as typical of these latter and subjects them to brief but illuminating comment, is well worth study. The only valid method in philosophy, so Jaspers holds, is the *scientific*, science rightly understood being tentative and always conscious of its proper limits, whereas the false philosophies propound a "total" knowledge which is really nothing other than bogus myth-making. The third lecture, on "Reason in its Struggle", again op-

poses the rational and the irrational, emphasizing the sinister growth in the contemporary world of those tendencies, latent in all of us, towards "mystery", absurdity, wizardry, and magic which issue in various forms of pseudo-belief, and, most dangerous of all, the simultaneous impulses towards both "blind unrestraint and blind obedience", the outcome of which has been seen in the aggressive anti-reason of Nazism. By the fact, moreover, that anti-reason uses the language of philosophy itself even the elect have been deceived. Without reason there can be no freedom, for the one is the necessary condition of the other. Professor Jaspers concludes with some reflections on the symptomatic decline in the status of philosophy in the universities to-day. His second lecture, on the nature of Reason, is the most difficult and the least rewarding. The style is oracular and cryptic, and the meaning is obscured rather than clarified by the author's fondness for the metaphorical. The manner may be congenial enough to his German readers, but to us, with our preference for lucid and straightforward exposition and argument, this Delphic attitude is merely intimidating. But the book as a whole deserves careful perusal.

B. M. G. Reardon.

Kelly Rectory,
Devon.

Die ehe in Pietismus. By Fritz Tanner. Zwingli Verlag, Zürich. Fr. 11.95.

This is a detailed account of the right and wrong use of sex in marriage as taught and practised in the second half of the seventeenth and first half of the eighteenth century by the pietist leaders of the Protestant religious communities which sprang up in Germany and Bohemia after the close of the disastrous thirty years' war in 1648. The subject of marriage assumed a particular importance among the communities because of their authoritarian and perfectionist leanings and the moral chaos from which they wished to separate. Two main streams of thought are traced. One, deriving from the theosophical speculations of Jacob Boehme (1575-1624) and carried on by Gichtel (1638-1710), taught that all sex (Eva) is under the dominion of Satan and marriage is either to be avoided or sublimated by a spiritual conjunction with the heavenly wisdom (Sophia). The other, represented by the brilliant and attractive Count Zinzendorf (1700-60), taught that sex in marriage is natural and good but emphasized the duty of married Christians to wage incessant warfare against the temptation to treat what is intended to be a means as an end. The author brings forward many variations on these themes from contemporary sources and concludes that the argument was unresolved then as it is now. In the absence of a conclusion one is left free to admire the intense concentration of these early Protestant thinkers upon discovering "the mind of Christ" and their modern and uninhibited approach to a difficult problem of moral casuistry.

George Goyder.

Rotherfield Greys.

PENITENCE AND FORGIVENESS. By Wilfred L. Knox. New edition. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

Wilfred Knox had an exceptional aptitude for explaining Christian faith and practice in a clear and concise manner. He also knew the difficulties that occur to undergraduates and others, because he met them in his own mind as well as elsewhere. His gifts as a teacher are seen at their best in this welcome reprint, to which the Bishop of Ely contributes an introductory memoir.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: William E. Wilson, *Essential Christianity* (12s. 6d.).
ASSOCIATION FOR PROMOTING RETREATS: General List of Retreats, No. 110 (1s.).
BLACKFRIARS: St Thomas Aquinas, *How to Study* (with translation and exposition by Victor White, O.P.) (1s. 6d.).
BURNS OATES: *The Collected Works of Abbot Vonier*, Vol. III (The Soul and the Spiritual Life) (25s.).
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: Charles E. Raven, *Science and Religion* (21s.).
COLDWELL: H. W. Codrington, *Studies of the Syrian Liturgies* [Reprinted from *Eastern Churches Quarterly*, 1936–37] (5s.).
COLEBY (DEREHAM): Noel Boston and Eric Puddy, *Dereham: the biography of a Country Town* (15s.).
FABER AND FABER: Henry Suso, *The Little Book of Eternal Wisdom* and *The Little Book of Truth* (Translated by J. M. Clarke) (18s.).
GOLLANCZ: Martin Buber, *Eclipse of God* (15s.).
JOHAN GRUNDT TANUM FORLAG (OSLO): Johannes André, *Kristendom og Åndskrise* (n.p.).
HODDER AND STOUGHTON: *The New Testament in the Moffatt Translation* (Vest Pocket Edition) (7s. 6d.).
INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, *Maintaining the Evangelical Faith To-day* (6d.).
LONGMANS: Thomas Gilby, *Between Community and Society* (25s.); Edward Carpenter, *That Man Paul* (3s.); Martin Dibelius, *Paul* (7s. 6d.).
MOWBRAY: G. K. A. Bell, *The Word and the Sacraments* (2s. 6d.); Kenneth N. Ross, *Why I am not a Roman Catholic* (7s. 6d.); Joost de Blank, *"Is it Nothing to You?"* [A Good Friday meditation] (2s. 6d.).
PATERNOSTER PRESS: F. F. Bruce, *Light in the West* (The Second Thoughts Library, No. 8) (6s. 6d.).
S.C.M. PRESS: Leslie Hunter, *The Seed and the Fruit* (8s. 6d.); David Cairns, *The Image of God in Man* (18s.); J. H. Oldham, *Life is Commitment* (12s. 6d.).
S.P.C.K.: Peter Winckworth, *The Seal of the Confessional and the Law of Evidence* (1s.); Brother George, O.S.P., *The Gate of Faith: some thoughts on the Creed* (2s. 6d.).
S.P.C.K. (FOR THE CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY): Geoffrey Soden, *Godfrey Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester*, 1583–1656 (42s.); E. E. Yelverton, *The Manual of Olavus Petri*, 1529 (15s.).
SPEMANN (STUTTGART): Friedrich Thieberger, *Die Glaubensstufen des Judentums* (DM. 11.80).
THE UNION (CEYLON): C. W. Hale Amos, *How Episcopacy Works* (n.p.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher